

Policy Implementation Committee Meeting

June 26, 2014

1:30 – 3:30 pm

Minutes – 6/26/2014

Members present:

Sonia Brandon, CMU

Andy Burns, FLC

Dave Deffenbacher, CU-Denver

Dale Gaubatz, WSU

Karen Lemke, ASU

John Marshall, CMU

Timalyn O'Neill, CSU

Perry Sailor, CU-Boulder

Kay Schneider, CSM

Paul Sharp, UNC

Robert Stubbs, CU-Boulder

Vaughn Toland, MSU-Denver

DHE Staff present: Beth Bean, Rhonda Epper, Brenda Bautsch

- Questions were raised about whether the mid-50% range communications tool would cause low-income, first-generation, and students of color students to self-select out of applying to an institution if they fell below the range
 - During the release of the communications tool, DHE should clearly communicate that the tool presents information on admitted students—meaning that students can get in with the scores/GPAs displayed, even if they are in the bottom 25% (although they may need additional credentials, letters of recommendation, etc.)
 - It's important to keep in mind diversity and equity concerns and not dissuade students from applying
 - Dale mentioned that taking away the window doesn't constrain institutional practice regarding admissions.
- Decision was made around how the mid-50% range will be calculated: **DHE will do the calculation based on data on admitted students**
- Institutions can still set and use GPA proxies under the new policy
 - **Beth will ask DAG about how proxy GPAs should be reported to SURDS (this was a concern that Dave had)**
- There was discussion on whether we need to amend policy to reflect other indicators of high school performance to accommodate competency-based and other approaches being used. It was determined that section 4.01.02.02 Grade Point Average (GPA) in the new policy provides sufficient flexibility for institutions to consider alternate grading methodologies used by schools.
- Discussion occurred on whether to use 1 year of data or 3 year rolling averages for the mid-50% range

- Beth will ask DAG about the preference of 1 year vs. 3 years
- Questions were raised about how to define selectivity without the index. Beth noted that selectivity assignments are already set in statute (and in 1319), so the bigger question at hand is: Moving forward, what are the guidelines for how an institution can change its selectivity category if it wants to? Important to note that the group agreed no change in selectivity would be recommended in this process—status quo is assumed.
 - Beth will form a DAG working group (to include at least Sonia, Rob and Dave) to come up with these guidelines and report back to PIC at the July 17 meeting.
- The guidelines will be presented to CCHE at the September meeting, after being presented to the PIC group in July.
- There was discussion of whether the index will still be used under the new admission policy. Sonia indicated that CMU will continue to use the index for internal purposes.
- In 2019, the index will no longer be used as a “public facing” statewide indicator for admissions or accountability.
- Rhonda noted that the new policy requires institutions to incorporate the PWR Endorsed Diploma (either guaranteed admission or priority consideration) as part of their admissions standards.
- The question “What criteria will CCHE use to evaluate institutions’ admission standards” was addressed
 - CMU noted that the approval should reflect that an institution is adhering to its role and mission and the strategic plan.
 - John Marshall will bring in a sample criteria statement to the next meeting as well as materials demonstrating how CMU meets the approval criteria.
 - Vaughn and Dale will also bring sample admissions standards materials.
 - Rhonda brought up the point that the criteria for approving the admissions materials could also include goals set forth in the CCHE admissions policy such as encouraging diversity, informing students about how to prepare, etc.
- An update was provided about the PARCC assessment and questions were raised regarding whether PARCC (and Accuplacer/Compass) should be named in the admissions policy since it has been designed as a placement tool, not an admissions tool
 - Further discussions will be held regarding whether or not to remove PARCC from the admissions policy.
- Below is an update to the PIC progress table based on the meeting:

Date	Topic	Progress	Decision made
January 23, 2014	How will the new policy impact institutions enrollment?	complete	Unknown (but don’t expect a large negative impact)
February 27, 2014	Is the window Useful? Do we need it in the policy?	complete	If we use mid-50 no window, if we use minimum standards use window.

April 3, 2014	How will institutions define rigor?	complete	IHE's want to use the HEAR language in policy
April 24, 2014	How should selectivity be defined without the index?	In-progress	DAG working group will develop guidelines using Mid-50 that correspond with current selectivity definitions. Will also develop guidelines for how an institution could request a change in selectivity. This will be presented to PIC on July 17, and proposed to CCHE as a policy change at September meeting.
June 26, 2014	How should institutions calculate the mid-50% ranges for their Admission Standards?	complete	Will be based on admitted students. DHE will do calculation.
July 17, 2014	What criteria will CCHE use to evaluate institutions' admission standards?	In-progress	CMU (John) will bring in a sample criteria statement to July 17 meeting as well as materials demonstrating how CMU meets the approval criteria. CDHE staff will propose to CCHE as a policy change at Sept. meeting.

Committee Charge is to review admissions, enrollment and academic range data from the institutions to help

1. Determine the impact that this new policy and the minimum admissions standards will have on enrollment decisions;
2. Determine whether the window serves as a useful tool for institutions admission procedures;
3. Answer the key data questions the Department received during the review process;
4. Provide guidance on whether institutions should work within their selectivity groups to develop minimum standards that align with one another; and
5. Guide the process of institutions in developing minimum standards.

Next meeting information:

July 17, 2014

1:30pm – 3:30pm

Emily Griffith Conference Room

DHE, 1560 Broadway

Denver, CO 80202

Call in information:

1-877-820-7831

Participant code: 215368#